

III. REMARKS

Applicants have considered the current Office Action with mailing date of March 25, 2008. Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 7 and 10 have been amended. Applicants are not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the allowable subject matter noted by the Office. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Bau, III et al. (U.S. 2003/0023957), hereafter “Bau.”. Applicants respectfully traverse the Office’s rejection on the followings grounds.

With respect to independent claims 1, 7, and 10, Applicants assert that Bau fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, Bau fails to disclose, *inter alia*, “client requester means for issuing client requests comprising at least one client request to call a web service, wherein the at least one client request to call a web service is sent to a callback web service.” More specifically, Bau does not disclose a separate element (a callback web service) that receives the client request and subsequently sends the request to the web service. On the contrary, Bau discloses “web services 104 receive a message over networking fabric 100 from a remote device such as user client 112 (802).” (See paragraph [0072]; see also

paragraph [0031] “At run time, enhanced web services 104 of the present invention receives messages from remote clients requesting that one or more web service methods be invoked.”). In other words, as understood by Applicants, Bau discloses the client requests to be sent directly over the network to the web services. Bau does not disclose a callback web service that receives the client request.

Accordingly, since Bau does not disclose a call back web service, Bau also fails to disclose “callback web service means coupled to the client requester means for simultaneously registering the at least one client request to call a web service and invoking the called web serviced by sending the at least one client request to call a web service to the called web service.”

In the rejection, the Office cites to paragraphs [0045]-[0049] and [0059]-[0062] of Bau and asserts that Bau discloses this feature of the claimed invention. See Final Office Action, page 2. However, Applicants respectfully disagree. In these paragraphs, Bau first discloses how developers can declare asynchronous responses using an inner interface and a member variable to create a client proxy object. Second, Bau describes asynchronous external services. Therefore, not only does Bau not disclose a callback web service, but no where in these cited paragraphs does Bau disclose simultaneously registering the client request for a web service within a callback web service and invoking a called web service by sending the client request to the called web service. In fact, it is not possible for Bau to disclose a callback web service means that invokes a called web serviced by sending the client request because, in Bau, the web service is directly connected over the network to the client and the messages are already received.

In addition to the arguments presented, Applicants reassert the arguments previously made in the Amendment of December 17, 2007 that Bau fails to disclose “response web service

means coupled to the callback web service means for receiving a response to the at least one client request to call a web service and coupled to the client requester means for delivering the response when a client request to obtain the response is issued from the client requester means.”

In the Final Office Action, the Office asserts that “it is irrelevant for Applicants to argue that a response to a client request is automatically or manually delivered when the response becomes available because that feature is not in the claim.” See Final Office Action, page 4-5. However, Applicants respectfully assert that the feature is in the claim and that the response in the claimed invention is only delivered **when the client requester issues a request to obtain the response from the response web service**. In Bau, a response to a client request is automatically delivered to a caller by a proxy object when the response becomes available.

As such, Applicants assert that Bau fails to disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 7, and 10. Applicants request that the Office withdraw the rejections with respect to these claims. Since claims 2-6 and 8-9 depend from independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable.

However, should the Office maintain the rejections, Applicants request that the Office further clarify how Bau allegedly discloses client requester means for issuing client requests comprising at least one client request to call a web service, wherein the issued client requests are sent to a callback web service. For example, Applicants request that the Office indicate where Bau discloses the issued client requests to be sent to the callback web service. Further, Applicants request that the Office further clarify how Bau discloses a callback web service means coupled to the client requester means for simultaneously registering the at least one client request to call a web service and invoking the called web serviced by sending the at least one client

request to call a web service to the called web service and a response web service means coupled to the callback web service means for receiving a response to the at least one client request to call a web service and coupled to the client requester means for delivering the response when a client request to obtain the response is issued from the client requester means.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ John A. Merecki /

Date: May 15, 2008

John A. Merecki
Reg. No.: 35,812
(EC)

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)